

Ventura County Community College District

Minutes of the District Technical Review Workgroup

August 28, 2008

12:30 p.m. – 2:20 p.m.

Present: Chancellor's Designee: Richard Durán
 Executive Vice Presidents: Brenda Shubert (MC), Ramiro Sanchez (VC)
 Faculty Co-Chairs of Curriculum Committees: Marie Panec (MC), Peter Sezzi (VC)
 Articulation Officers: Letrisha Mai (MC), Jeff Ferguson (VC)
 Academic Senate Appointees: Margaret Tenant (MC), P. Scott Corbett (OC), Paulette Johnson (VC)

Guest: Richard Dawe, Vice Chancellor of Planning and Organizational Development

Absent: Jaime Casillas (OC), Jeannette Redding (OC), Shannon Ordonez (OC), Student Government Appointees: (MC, VC, OC)

Recorder: Lynn-Marie Glaze

Minutes:

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
Welcome and introductions	<p>Dr. Richard Durán opened the first DTRW meeting for the academic year, welcomed the team members, and stated his intention to cover organizational details for the committee.</p> <p>Introductions:</p> <p>As the new Chancellor's designee to the DTRW, Dr. Durán has had similar responsibilities at a previous institution, but will need familiarization with Title 5 regulations. He believes that the purpose of the committee is to determine what is ultimately best for students.</p> <p>Dr. Richard Dawe, Vice Chancellor of Planning and Organizational Development, attended this first meeting to meet the members and familiarize himself with the focus of this committee.</p> <p>Team members introduced themselves, and there were some discussions of member</p>			

	<p>representatives and new participants for this academic year.</p> <p>New members this year include:</p> <p>Richard Durán, Chancellor's Designee Brenda Shubert, MC Executive Vice President Jaime Casillas, OC Executive Vice President Marie Panec, MC Faculty Co-Chair of Curriculum Committee Peter Sezzi, VC Faculty Co-Chair of Curriculum Committee</p>			
<p>Review of minutes from 5/9/08</p>	<p>Jeff Ferguson would like to reinstate the review of the minutes by the Co-chair, after Chair review. Copies of draft minutes that have been approved by the Chair and Co-chair will be distributed to committee members prior to future meetings to allow adequate time for review and corrections.</p> <p>There was one suggested change to the 5/8/08 minutes on Page 5, to change the paragraph discussing the addition of a disclaimer "under review for sate approval" to indicate that this subject has been discussed.</p> <p>As stated in the minutes, action items have either been completed or are in the process of completion. Dr. Durán suggested more specific information regarding responsible parties for each action item.</p> <p>Scott Corbett moved and Margaret Tennant seconded the approval of the minutes with suggested changes.</p>	<p>L-M Glaze will make recommended changes to minutes, as discussed.</p>		
<p>Role of committee, membership responsibilities</p>	<p>To provide background for new members, Dr. Durán explained that the committee was formed after negotiations and discussions with academic representatives on how to process District-wide issues. Page 26 of the Participatory Governance Handbook provides a review of the committee member roles, etc. These meetings are the final step before curriculum changes are</p>			

	<p>presented to Board, and are intended to assure compliance with Title 5 regulations.</p> <p>No student representatives have historically attended these meetings, but Richard Durán would like to have students participate. Committee members will ask the Associated Student Government Presidents to suggest student members, and provide the names to Lynn-Marie Glaze for inclusion in meeting notices and invitations.</p> <p>The Co-chair position should be rotated each year, as per the Participatory Governance Handbook; as Jeff Ferguson served as Co-chair last year, the committee will need to choose a new Co-chair. Marie Panec was identified as the new Co-chair.</p> <p>Jeff Ferguson described himself as "Keeper of the Golden Rule," which was an operating agreement previously adopted by the committee. Jeff also reminded the committee that there was discussion at last meeting of proposed changes to the Participatory Governance Handbook, some of which were agreed upon, ie, rather than refer to "programs" members will use the term "proficiency awards."</p>	<p>Add students to attendees list, once identified.</p> <p>J Ferguson bill bring proposed changes discussed last year to the next meeting.</p>		
<p>Review of Group Norms (Agenda items IV.C.1a and IV.C.1b)</p>	<p><i>(The Committee was not certain of source of these two items proposed for inclusion.)</i> As an aid to her successor, Eva Conrad had suggested two additions to group norms, as indicated on the agenda.</p> <p>Item 1a: The group felt that the Participatory Governance Handbook language was adequate as printed, and thought that the self survey addressed this item as already accomplished, as per the minutes of the May 2008 meeting.</p> <p>Item 1b: Group members feel that this charge is also adequately covered in the Participatory</p>	<p>The members agreed that they will continue to operate under the guidelines previously established.</p>		

	<p>Governance Handbook.</p> <p>Consensus was reached that these changes will not be incorporated at this time.</p>			
<p>Procedures flow chart</p>	<p>Jeff Ferguson reminded the group that DTRW is a new committee in name only, but has functioned for over a decade as a sub-committee of DCSL. Now it is a separate workgroup, and there have been previous issues with the contract language.</p> <p>Richard Durán inquired about the relationship of this group now to the DCSL. Scott Corbett indicated that there is not much interaction, but issues common to both groups are shared through common membership to both groups.</p> <p>Jeff Ferguson added that, for example, this group will review course repetition, which will be reviewed by DCSL, also.</p> <p>Richard Duran confirmed that there are methods in place for members to share information and recommendations with curriculum committees at each campus.</p> <p>Ramiro Sanchez related that he shares information specific to each Dean regarding items that pertain to their specific areas. He also shares DTRW information with the academic senates.</p> <p>Richard Duran asked whether the communication flow should be formalized.</p> <p>Ramiro Sanchez indicated that Luminis reports would be a good source of sharing information, but how to enforce that interested parties actually look at the information?</p> <p>Scott Corbett reported that his practice has been to post the DTRW minutes on the website for sharing with the campus, which will now continue in Luminis.</p> <p>The suggested wording of "Associate in Arts Degree General Studies" will be shared with the DCSL at some future time, and will also be a</p>	<p>The group agreed to be sure to share information District-wide of items that pertain to curriculum. It was agreed that there will be further communication of cross-district methods</p>		

	future DTRW agenda item to further clarify.			
Curriculum review	<p>There were no new additions or changes to curriculum from any of the three campuses. Scott Corbett indicated that the Math 9 A-C repeatability was discussed at OC Curriculum committee.</p> <p>Jeff Ferguson will assume responsibility for the development of a standardized District proficiency award template that could be used by individual departments. This would allow for price breaks on printing of certificate templates.</p>	Jeff Ferguson will draft a standardized District proficiency award template		
Excerpts from Participatory Governance Handbook for recommended changes (Handout)	<p>As indicated on the handout, there have been suggested changes to Page 27 of the Participatory Governance Handbook:</p> <p>Jeff Ferguson feels that the suggested changes remain to be discussed further.</p> <p>The Action Item of development of a style guide was revisited, and the various items to be covered under this style guide were discussed.</p> <p>Scott Corbett indicated that Page 28 of the Participatory Governance Handbook provides some guidelines as to the definition of "substantive" change, and the list of non-substantive issues is provided. The DTRW should develop a list of substantive changes for additional clarification.</p>	R Duran recommends review of these changes at the next meeting.		
Flow chart for Review, Approval, and Submission of Curriculum Changes	<p>Jeff Ferguson proposed that this document be reviewed and discussed at next meeting. Some inaccuracies are noted.</p> <p>Paulette Johnson indicated that some of these items may be covered in the proposed CurricuNet program.</p>	Team members will review current document, and bring proposed changes to the next meeting.		
Meeting dates/times	<p>Jeff Ferguson commented that the meeting needs to be a minimum of 2 hours. Richard Durán agreed, and the committee chose to have a meeting start time of 1:00 pm.</p> <p>Consensus: Meetings will begin at 1:00 pm and</p>	Lynn-Marie Glaze will update		

	end at 3:00 pm	the Committee web page and yearly meeting schedule to reflect the new start time of 1:00 pm		
Priorities for 2008-2009 DTRW	<p>Item B1: Substantial changes to Title 5 regarding competencies would indicate need for establishments of minimum competencies and uniformity.</p> <p>Jeff Ferguson recommends faculty review of competencies for clarification and uniformity. Historically, there has been difficulty in arriving at decisions regarding such issues.</p> <p>Scott Corbett: What do you see as a timetable for this item?</p> <p>J Ferguson: As it is not possible now to make the schedule deadlines the committee should work with the catalog deadlines, but with two readings required by the Board of Trustees and one read by DTRW, this timeline may be difficult.</p> <p>Changes must be completed in early spring (end of April) to meet these requirements, so discussions should be started in Fall.</p> <p>Scott Corbett: What will be flow of review?</p> <p>Ramiro Sanchez: The ad hoc committee makes recommendations, which is taken to the campus curriculum committees, and then returns to DTRW for final adoption.</p> <p>Steps: The committee will discuss definitions based on criteria, will made recommendations that will be returned to curriculum committees.</p> <p>Margaret Tennant: The model for degree changes worked very well. A core group was formed who did the majority of review and made recommendations, then returned to DTRW for final approval.</p> <p>An ad hoc committee will be formed, made up of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area dean for math, department chair for math 	<p>The DTRW members will develop a list of courses to be reviewed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendations returned to DTRW for final approval 		

	<p>- Area dean for English, department chair for English</p> <p>The ad hoc committee will arrange district-wide meetings with their campus equivalents.</p> <p>The DTRW will create a charge for the ad hoc committee, to provide a scope of requested actions.</p> <p>Recommendations will be returned to campus curriculum committees, then approved changes will be forwarded to DTRW for final approval and submission to Board.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Admissions Officers will develop appropriate course lists for further definition, with related documentation. 2. Packet goes to ad hoc committee (cc to curriculum committees), Deans, and co-chairs for District-wide discussion. <p>Jeff Ferguson will head the process definition, with a timeline and action steps to be added.</p>			
<p>V.B.2: Meaning and Process for “Local Approval” of experimental courses</p>	<p>The meaning of “local approval” and the process for experimental courses was discussed.</p> <p>Experimental courses require Board approval. The DTRW did not historically forward these courses to Board. The Curriculum Institute ListServe had a serial discussion of the issue, and it was determined that the current practice for District has not followed Title 5 exactly for experimental courses.</p> <p>Jeff Ferguson recommended that DTRW request to not bring these experimental courses to Board for review, due to the transient nature of the courses and the long process for receiving approval. The law reads that the Board can approve experimental courses as consent items, or grant authorization for special course approval to be delegated to the campus curriculum committees.</p>	<p>Richard Duran recommends further clarification prior to asking the Chancellor and the Board for delegation of authority.</p> <p>A subcommittee will be formed to address this issue.</p> <p>This item will carry forward to next meeting.</p>		

<p>Upcoming Meeting Notes</p>	<p>Paulette Johnson suggested adding CurricuNet submissions of course changes.</p> <p>Items from previous minutes to be revisited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communication flow for discussion items from DTRW back to campuses - Definition of "substantive" to be clarified - Lexicon or style guide to be revisited - Changes to the Participatory Governance Handbook, with further review of draft document (IV.B.) - Flow / procedures document to be reviewed and refined - Local approval of experimental courses 	<p>Jeff Ferguson will provide applicable Title 5 regulations for each discussion item, noted by page number of electronic version of Title 5, rather than copy and distribute multiple documents.</p>		
<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>Thursday, September 25, 2008 1:00 - 3:00 pm</p>			